

REMARKS

Claims 6, 8, 11, and 14 are pending in the application. Independent claims 6 and 11 have been amended to recite that the electrically-conductive bridge is "formed by wire-bonding technology" (claim 6) or "formed by surface-mount technology" (claim 11). The amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed (see, e.g., specification at page 4, line 16 to page 5, line 3; page 7, line 1 to page 8, line 2; and FIGS. 5-7).

As amended, independent claims 6 and 11 recite a ball grid array (BGA) package in which an electrically-conductive bridge is formed by wire-bonding or surface-mount technology and mounted to span in an overhead manner across an interposing electrically-conductive trace so as to electrically connect bond fingers to corresponding vias. Because the BGA package is implemented using existing wire-bonding or surface-mount technology, it can be produced in a cost-effective manner (see, e.g., specification at page 7, line 19 to page 8, line 2).

Claims 6 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's Prior Art Figures 3 and 4 (APAF)" in view of Japanese Publication 60-157238 to "Takahama". Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over APAF in view of Takahama, and further in view of U.S. Patent 3,560,256 to Abrams. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over APAF in view of Takahama and Abrams. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The proposed combinations of "APAF" in view of the Takahama and/or Abrams do not teach or suggest a ball grid array package in which an electrically-conductive bridge is formed by wire-bonding or surface-mount technology, and mounted to span in an overhead manner across an interposing electrically-conductive trace, as recited in independent claims 6 and 11.

On pages 3 and 5 of the Office Action of 05/25/2007, thick aluminum wires 8 of Takahama were cited as allegedly corresponding to the Applicant's claimed "electrically-conductive bridge."

However, the thick aluminum wires 8 of Takahama are not formed by wire-bonding technology or surface-mount technology, and do not span across an interposing electrically-conductive trace, as required by independent claims 6 and 11.

In Takahama, the thick aluminum wires 8 are provided over a semiconductor element 6 and its electrode 3, which do not correspond to the claimed "interposing electrically-conductive trace" of the Applicant's claimed invention.

Moreover, the thick aluminum wires 8 of Takahama connect semiconductor elements 4 and 5, but are not used for connecting traces *as claimed*.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion that the thick aluminum wires 8 of Takahama are somehow formed using existing wire-bonding or surface-mounted technology *as claimed*.

For at least the reasons described above, the proposed combinations of "APAF" in view of Takahama and/or Abrams do not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 6 and 11. Therefore, independent claims 6 and 11 and dependent claims 8 and 14 are patentable over the proposed combinations.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Date: August 27, 2007

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874